

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Cote1965>

7A23
1965
+ 25

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

PERCEIVED BELIEF DISSONANCE AS A SOURCE OF DISAFFECTION
BETWEEN FRENCH-SPEAKING AND ENGLISH-SPEAKING CANADIANS

by

ANDRÉ DAVID JOSEPH CÔTÉ

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

AUGUST, 1965

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Perceived Belief Dissonance As A Source of Disaffection Between French-Speaking and English-Speaking Canadians" submitted by André David Joseph Côté in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

ABSTRACT

From a general theoretical basis that intolerance is a function of perceived belief dissonance three hypotheses were tested in the present investigation. The main hypothesis was that French-speaking Canadians perceive English-speaking Canadians not in terms of ethnic or racial categories but in terms of the extent to which the belief systems of the English-speaking Canadians are congruent with their own.

Minor hypotheses tested were that the extent of the belief incongruence claimed by the French-speaking Canadians are related to the extent of the rigidity with which they hold their own beliefs and their intolerance of the beliefs of others.

Appropriate tests were administered to three French-speaking samples and to one English-speaking Canadian sample.

Statistical analysis of the results validated the main hypothesis as well as the latter of the minor hypotheses.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude and appreciation to all those whose help made this thesis possible. Particular thanks are due to Dr. C.C. Anderson, committee chairman, whose inspiration, guidance, and supervision in every aspect of this study contributed more toward its completion than any other factor. The helpful and constructive criticisms of Professor Madeleine Monod and Professor R.C. Motut are gratefully acknowledged.

The able assistance generously offered by Dr. S.M. Hunka, and Messrs. M.W. Wahlstrom, W. Muir and D.P. Flathman, in the processing and analysis of the data is deeply appreciated.

I am indebted to all the high school principals who made the testing of my widely scattered sample feasible. The contribution of each is acknowledged with gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	RELATED RESEARCH	5
III.	MEASUREMENTS AND SUBJECTS	13
	Samples	13
	Measurement	14
	Belief-Incongruence	14
	Opinionation	18
	Rigidity-Flexibility	19
IV.	RESULTS	21
	Belief Patterns	21
	Reliability of the Data	26
	Analysis of the Data	29
V.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	42
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	45
	APPENDIX A	51
	APPENDIX B	64

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	COMPONENTS AND DISTRIBUTION OF BELIEF PATTERNS FOR THE FRENCH-CANADIAN URBAN SAMPLE	22
II.	COMPONENTS AND DISTRIBUTION OF BELIEF PATTERNS FOR THE FRENCH-CANADIAN RURAL-URBAN SAMPLE	23
III.	COMPONENTS AND DISTRIBUTION OF BELIEF PATTERNS FOR THE FRENCH-CANADIAN RURAL SAMPLE	24
IV.	COMPONENTS AND DISTRIBUTION OF BELIEF PATTERNS FOR THE ENGLISH-CANADIAN SAMPLE	25
V.	RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR DIFFERENCE SCORES ON SPECIFIC AND GENERAL BELIEFS	28
VI.	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DISCRIMINATION RESPONSES, WHEN BOTH ETHNIC GROUP AND BELIEF ARE VARIED (TYPE EB), AND ETHNIC DISCRIMINATION (TYPE E) AND BELIEF DISCRIMINATION (TYPE B) REPOSSES	31
VII.	MEAN ACCEPTANCE OF FRENCH-CANADIANS AND ENGLISH-CANADIANS WITH BELIEF HELD CONSTANT, AND MEAN ACCEPTANCE OF THOSE WHO AGREE AND THOSE WHO DISAGREE WITH ETHNIC GROUP HELD CONSTANT, FOR GROUPS MANIFESTING COMMON BELIEF PATTERNS	34
VIII.	MEAN ACCEPTANCE OF FRENCH-CANADIANS AND ENGLISH-CANADIANS WITH BELIEF HELD CONSTANT, AND MEAN ACCEPTANCE OF THOSE WHO AGREE AND THOSE WHO DISAGREE WITH ETHNIC GROUP HELD CONSTANT, FOR GROUPS MANIFESTING UNIQUE BELIEF PATTERNS	35
IX.	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ACCEPTANCE OF FRENCH-CANADIANS AND ENGLISH-CANADIANS, AND CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ACCEPTANCE OF THOSE WHO AGREE AND THOSE WHO DIS-AGREE, FOR COMMON BELIEF PATTERN GROUPS	37
X.	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ACCEPTANCE OF FRENCH-CANADIANS AND ENGLISH-CANADIANS, AND CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ACCEPTANCE OF THOSE WHO AGREE AND THOSE WHO DIS-AGREE, FOR UNIQUE BELIEF PATTERN GROUPS	38
XI.	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FLEXIBILITY-RIGIDITY AND OPINIONATION SCORES AND TYPE E, TYPE B, AND TYPE EB DIFFERENCE SCORES	40

CHAPTER I

I. INTRODUCTION

At the present time¹ a certain amount of désaccord exists between French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians. Central to this désaccord, as Rokeach (1960) has demonstrated in the case of Negro-White disaffection in the United States, is the dissonance² between the belief systems of the parties involved. The power of such a belief incongruence, the subject of the present investigations, is exemplified by Weinreich (1953).

Several villages around Murten (in Switzerland). . . have German and French mother-tongue groups which are exclusively Protestant and Catholic, respectively. The religious division acts as an even greater barrier to the integration of the communes than the linguistic one, so that in the bilingual but unireligious communes the contact of the two mother-tongue groups is considerably more intimate. A villager as a rule is more conscious of his neighbour's denomination than his mother-tongue. Not only is intermarriage quite rare, but everyday activities, too, are separated according to denominations. Thus, in the village of Courteman there are two inns: a Protestant and a Catholic one. A surprising amount of linguistic self-sufficiency and unilingualism is possible in a denominationally divided bilingual village like Wallenreid (1953, pp. 92-93).

¹Rapport préliminaire de la commission royale d'enquête sur le bilinguisme et le biculturalisme, Ottawa, L'Imprimeur de la Reine, 1965.

²Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance asserts that an individual experiences discomfort when he holds logically inconsistent cognitions about an object or event, and that he is thus motivated to reduce the dissonance through cognitive and attitudinal changes.

Wylie, (1962) an astute American observer of the French scene, provides another example³ which is more relevant to the context of the present désaccord.

One way in which Americans and Frenchmen seem clearly to differ is in their conception of the rules that govern social behavior. The French generally believe that it is right for people to be forced to accept the sharply defined framework which man has projected onto the chaos into which he is born. Americans, on the other hand, generally feel that individuals should not be hampered in their free development but should discover for themselves the rules that govern the naturally ordered reality into which they are born (1962, p. 198).

An extreme but instructive version of this theme was provided in a comment appearing in the November 29, 1964 supplement of the Toronto Globe and Mail:

But knowing French or English does not automatically reveal the deep cultural depths which exist in our two races. A French-speaking Orangeman still thinks like an Orangeman and an English-speaking member of the St. Jean-Baptiste Society still thinks like John the Baptist.

Logically implicit in these examples is the hypothesis validated by Rokeach (1960) and Stein, Hardyck and Smith, (1965), that an observer does not perceive other people primarily in terms of ethnic or racial categories but in terms of sorts of belief systems which are either congruent or incongruent with his own. Accordingly the main hypothesis to be tested in the current investigation is that the désaccord existing between French-speaking and English-speaking

³Others can be gathered from Métraux's and Mead's (1953, pp. 13-14) discussion of themes in French culture.

Canadians is, to some extent functionally related to marked differences in their beliefs on salient issues.

It is a frequently advanced and widely-held view that, from a linguistic and cultural aspect, the differences between French-speaking and English-speaking persons in Western Canada are insignificant. A popular argument is that this is due to two generations of assimilation via the school systems of this province. In brief, French-Canadians in the West are "Westerners" in all respects with the exception that they speak French. Our results will provide an empirical, albeit tentative, evaluation of the validity of this view.

In the following chapter details will be given to support the present contention that a correlation⁴ exists between the extent and effect of belief incongruence and two related variables, viz--rigidity--flexibility defined as a reasonably stable trait which is associated with the degree of difficulty experienced by an individual in ". . .acquiring new habits or response sets that conflict with old well-established habits or mental sets" (Rubenowitz, 1963, p. 11) and degree and direction of opinionation, defined as a broad and coherent pattern of general intolerance, not necessarily related to any specific

⁴It is presumed that these variables will be determinants of the effect of belief incongruence, but only psychometric relationships can be established from the present investigation.

ideological content, possessed by individuals (Rokeach, 1960, p. 81). Minor hypothesis will take the form of an attempt to replicate these relationships from the responses of the present group of subjects.

CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

Recent research (Rokeach, 1960; Byrne, 1961; Byrne and Wong, 1962; Lambert, Gardner, Barik and Tunstall, 1963; Rubenowitz, 1963; Anisfeld and Lambert, 1964; Rokeach and Rothman, 1965; Stein, Hardyck and Smith, 1965) indicates that the most significant variable which affects an individual's bias, for or against members of other races or ethnic groups, in a dyadic situation, is his perception of the other's beliefs as being either similar or contrary to, his own beliefs. Specifically, an individual who perceives another person as having beliefs similar to his will prefer that person over some other person whose beliefs he sees as being contrary to his, without apparent regard for race or ethnic affiliation. That this is true also for groups has been strikingly demonstrated by Rokeach (1960).

In his Negro-White study, Rokeach asked White college students, enrolled at Michigan State University and at the University of Houston in Texas, to indicate whether they were for or against four general beliefs (God, Communism, Labour Unions, and Socialized Medicine) and four specific Negro-White beliefs (desegregation, inter-racial fraternities and sororities, racial equality, residential restrictions imposed by race). Subjects were then asked to indicate their degree of preference for White and Negro stimulus persons holding beliefs similar to or opposed to their own. The major finding in all samples

was that discriminatory responses are made primarily on the basis of belief congruence rather than on the basis of racial congruence. For example, a White Anglican would prefer to associate with a Negro Anglican rather than with a White Atheist.

Anderson (1965) has shown that belief-congruence is very similar to the "integrative orientation," defined as a desire to know more about the out group and ultimately to become a member of it (Lambert, 1963, p. 114), which has been found to be a major factor in promoting effective acquisition of a second language (Gardner and Lambert, 1959; Lambert, Gardner, Barik and Tunstall, 1963, p. 312).

The obverse of this, a clash of beliefs, is simply accepted by most writers as unpleasant. For example, Secord and Backman (1960) postulate that the locus of behavioural stability and change lies in an interpersonal matrix which has as one of its principal components, the individual's perception of those related aspects (beliefs) of the person with whom he is interacting. In the light of Secord and Backman's contention that an individual constantly strives to achieve congruency among the components of the interpersonal matrix, a consideration of the other two postulated components of the matrix (1 - an aspect of the self concept of the individual, and 2 - the individual's interpretation of those elements of his behaviour related to that aspect) suggests some powerful motivating factors which impel an individual to resolve a perceived conflict between ethnic group and

belief in favour of belief congruence. Society trains us to feel unhappy if the other person is hostile or even neutral to us (Ellis, 1963, p.61).

Of course this is not to deny that disaffection may, under certain circumstances, be produced by simple ethnic discrimination which has nothing to do with what the other person believes (Klineberg, 1949; Prasad, 1953; Vinacke, 1949; Prothro, 1953; Lambert and Klineberg, 1959; Triandis, 1961).

Foa (1964), concludes that a differentiation required by the culture seems more likely to be rewarded by that culture. This would appear to indicate that prejudicial attitudes or perhaps dispositions to people in general (Anisfeld, Munoz and Lambert, 1963; Rokeach, 1960, p. 145) are affected by the demands of the culture; which may in certain areas require its members to discriminate against others on the basis of race or ethnic affiliation in order to ensure its survival (Foa, 1964, p. 519). However, Rokeach admits that his conclusion does not apply where prejudice has been institutionalized in this way. "At the point where ethnic discrimination becomes institutionalized or sanctioned by law, as is most clearly the case in the South (United States) and in South Africa, social discrimination obviously will become coerced along ethnic and racial rather than belief lines (1960, p. 164)⁵. Rokeach rejects, and has been justified in this

⁵This may well be true in certain areas of Quebec and Ontario.

position (Stein, et al., 1965), the view that discrimination on ethnic grounds is widespread where there is an absence of institutionalized prejudice.

The minor hypotheses relating the effect of rigidity-flexibility and opinionation on the extent and effect of belief-incongruence were developed in the following way. It has been demonstrated that the presence of threat in an experimental situation produces behavioural rigidity (Feshback and Singer, 1957; Ainsworth, 1958; Sarason, 1961). For example, Ainsworth (1958) administered a water-jar test of problem solving rigidity, under conditions of stress, to subjects who had been rated as secure, or insecure. Stress was induced by urging the subjects to speed up their performance, and by imposing a time limit for problem solutions. It was found that the anxiety generated by the stressful situation made the subjects more rigid in their problem solving tactics.

Rubenowitz (1963) has indicated that the degree to which an individual perceives his social situation to be threatening makes his attitudes and behaviour more rigid.

Thus the extent to which the immediate situation in one way or another may be threatening to an individual must be considered as a contingent condition under which a disposition to act or think in a rigid way acts as a contributory condition. This must be kept in mind when studying manifestations of rigid attitudes such as prejudice (1963, p. 36).

For example, Kuhlén (in Birren, 1959, p. 81) considers the familiar tendency towards increasing rigidity with age. He reports

that many writers have tended to view most patterns of aging as essentially defensive maneuvers brought into play by the anxiety arising from the threats posed by the social and physical losses resulting from increasing age.

Now French-speaking Canadians as a minority group feel threatened by the English-speaking Canadians and their culture. Consider for example the problem of the French language and its survival in the modern world in the face of the two most widespread sorts of lingua franca, English and Russian. Anderson (1965) has indicated the worry this causes responsible authorities in France.

Since a language expresses (and is, therefore, perfectly associated with) the distinctive rules and values which represent a culture (Foa, 1964, p. 519) and inform the 'social character' (values and sense of personal worth) (Wheelis, 1958, pp. 18-19) of each of its natives, giving up a language, which appears to be heralded by beginning to learn L₂, can be interpreted as a betrayal of one's country and oneself (Weinreich, 1953, p. 101). This is the psychological basis of exhortations like "Il faut garder la langue" and of the desire by certain national groups to keep their languages 'pure' and free from contamination by neologisms of foreign origin (ibid., pp. 102-103). The same sort of substitution of a language for a religious faith may take place if the native speakers of that tongue belong predominantly to a particular denomination. Haugen (in Saporta, 1961, p. 399) quotes the following dictum as referring to the French Acadians: "Faith preserves language and language preserves faith."

The French, to judge from two reports in The Times of London (March 12 and May 30, 1964) and their Academie Francaise, are particularly exercised about the sort of verbal amalgam usually dubbed "Le Franglais" which sports

anglicisms such as 'le self-service,' 'le weekend,' 'un drunk,' 'le show business' and so on. This is a political issue also in that the De Gaullists are particularly hostile to anglicisms of this sort.

It is fairly likely that French-speaking Canadians share this feeling of linguistic threat.

Now it is a fair speculation that these feelings of threat will be experienced less by those who have had more contact with English-speaking people (Prothro, 1954; Prothro and Keehn, 1957; Keehn and Prothro, 1956; Anisfeld and Lambert, 1964). As Rubenowitz (1963) concludes,

A necessary pre-requisite for flexible behaviour is that several alternatives can be taken into consideration simultaneously. Thus, other things being equal, those who have more facts available, more education and experience, should have a greater possibility than others to behave and decide in a flexible way (1963, pp. 37-38).

For them there is a reduction of these feelings because the alien, always potentially dangerous, is known to some extent.

Under these conditions the fact that there is also likely to be a reduction in opinionation has been indicated by Anderson (1965).

In a 'closed' system of mental functioning, belief systems are absorbed from authorities as a network of defences against anxiety (ibid., p. 67) and information is evaluated on its own merit without concern for external and internal pressures (ibid., pp. 67-68) but by following the dictates of some administrative superior (ibid., p. 227). Under these circumstances, the strange, the foreign, is not welcome evidence of the variety of life, but a threat to be dealt with by avoidance behaviour at best. The mind is 'closed' in Rokeach's sense.

A glimpse of this is provided in work by Anisfeld and Lambert (1965) in which monolingual and bilingual French-Canadian children aged about 10 years listened to tape recordings of four 10-year old bilingual girls reading the same passage once in English, once in French, and rated each speaker's personality on fourteen socially-desirable traits. A first finding was that the children speaking French were rated more favourably on all traits and for all voices, significantly so on 'good-looking,' 'amusing,' 'religious,' 'self-confident,' 'kind,' 'nice,' 'trust-worthy,' 'wise (good),' and 'helpful' (ibid., p. 91). Anisfeld and Lambert (ibid., p. 90) report that this is the opposite of what they found in a previous study where adult French-Canadians rated the English speakers significantly more favourably on the traits. They suggest that this is because the child is still under the influence of his own local environment of French-Canadian family life and neighbourhood. Later the evaluation changes for the poorer when the adult encounters the larger community of Montreal.

However, whereas the bilinguals also rated the French voices more favourably on all of the traits, for all voices, not one of the differences was significant at the previously-accepted level ($p > .02$). In other words, the bilinguals are less susceptible to the general stereotypes of the English held by the French community in which they live perhaps because they have been encouraged by their parents to seek out and communicate with English speakers (ibid., p. 95). Certainly the bilinguals rate English-Canadians more favourably than do the monolinguals and attribute the same evaluation to their parents. Moreover, they identify themselves significantly more closely with English-Canadians than do monolinguals, in the sense that they rate the concept "me" and "English-Canadian" in a markedly more similar way than do monolinguals. Moreover, the bilinguals rate themselves significantly more favourably than the monolinguals (ibid., p. 94). This takes us back to Rokeach's (1960) finding that, even among southerners, there was a significant correlation between a rejection of Negroes and a rejection of whites, and his apt citation of the man in a New Yorker cartoon who is saying, "I hate everybody, regardless of race, creed, or color (1960, p. 45)."

Accordingly, the main hypothesis to be tested in the current

investigation is that French-speaking Canadians perceive English-speaking Canadians not in terms of ethnic or racial categories but in terms of the extent to which the belief systems of the English-speaking Canadians are congruent with their own.

Minor hypotheses to be tested are that the extent of the belief incongruence claimed by the French-speaking Canadians will be related to the extent of the rigidity with which they hold their own beliefs and their intolerance of the beliefs of others. Significant positive correlations should exist between these variables.

A subsidiary but interesting question concerns the influence of sex differences on all of the aforementioned variables. Findings will be adduced to provide information on this matter.

CHAPTER III

MEASUREMENTS AND SUBJECTS

I. SAMPLES

Three types of bilingual French-Canadian samples, and one English-Canadian sample were studied; all subjects were high school students taking either Grade 10, 11, or 12.

(1) French-Canadian Urban

The female members of this sample were drawn from the high school students at the Académie-Assomption in the City of Edmonton. All bilingual members of each class were used (N=65). The male members of this sample were drawn from the bilingual high school students belonging to French-Canadian parishes in the City of Edmonton. The youth clubs of St. Joachim and Immaculée-Conception parishes supplied the bulk of our sample (N=51).

(2) French-Canadian Rural-Urban

The members of this sample were drawn from the bilingual high school student population of the predominantly French-Canadian villages of Légal and Beaumont and their environs (N=67; Males = 35, Females = 32).

(3) French-Canadian Rural

This sample was drawn from the bilingual high school student population of the predominantly French-Canadian villages of Donnelly,

Falher and Guy, in the Peace River region of Alberta (N=130; Males = 53, Females = 77).

(4) English-Canadian

This sample was drawn from the students attending St. Mary's High School and Austin O'Brien High School in the City of Edmonton (N=113; Males - 51, Females - 62).

2. MEASUREMENT

(1) Belief-Incongruence

Some doubt has been cast upon the efficacy of the Rokeach (1960) technique for assessing the relative significance of race or belief congruence as determinants of prejudice. Triandis (1961, pp. 184-196) maintained that Rokeach's research technique neither adequately measured the concept of social distance, nor offered a sufficiently salient stimulus person to be considered by subjects. Correcting for these supposed shortcomings, Triandis carried out a study which found "race" not "belief" to be the most potent factor affecting social discrimination.

In his rebuttal, Rokeach (1961) argues that

Triandis' conclusion stems not so much from his use of a social distance scale, which he makes so much of, but from his use of the terms 'same philosophy - different philosophy,' which he makes so little of . . . Compare the impact of 'Negro, same philosophy' and 'White, different philosophy' with the impact of 'Negro who believes in God' and 'White-Atheist.' Here both race and belief are salient. Both variables are specific, concrete, easy to imagine, and easy to imagine that such people exist even if one has not personally met them (1961, p. 187).

In the opinion of the present writer this rebuttal invalidates Triandis' attack. Stein, Hardyck and Smith (1965) allege that the intra pair choices to be made are too obviously choices between "race" and "belief." However, this criticism of Rokeach is likely to be applicable only where the level of sophistication of the subjects is high (say, graduate students in psychology), and the present writer is confident that basing his experimental procedure on the design proposed by Rokeach, et al (1960, pp. 136-139) will allow an adequate test of his hypothesis.

Subjects were presented with 36 pairs of stimulus statements⁶ and asked to rate each of them on a 9-point scale, in which "1" represents "I can't see myself being friends with such a person," and "9" represents "I can very easily see myself being friends with such a person."

Three types of statements pairs were used as stimuli: (1) Type E pairs where the ethnic group (subject) is varied and the belief (characterization of subject)⁷ is held constant; (2) Type B pairs where the subject characterization is held constant and the subject is varied; (3) Type EB pairs where both subject and subject characterization are varied. For example if subjects rate one member of a pair

⁶The complete text of the questionnaire is to be found in the Appendix.

⁷Rokeach and Rothman (1965) use the more flexible terms Subject and Characterization to denote the variables which they are investigating.

differently from the other member of that pair it will be assumed that subjects are discriminating between pair members. It is obvious that discriminatory responses may be attributed solely to "subject" in Type E pairs, and solely to "characterization" in Type B pairs. The test of our hypothesis lies in the discriminatory responses which subjects will make to Type EB pairs. In this case subjects may discriminate either on the basis of ethnicity-subject or belief-characterization or both.⁸ If our hypothesis is valid, discriminatory responses to Type EB pairs should be made primarily on the basis of belief congruence.

The scoring of the test and the analysis of the results obtained were undertaken using the techniques described by Rokeach (1960, pp. 139-146). For each subject, separate scores were obtained for the three specific English-Canadian - French-Canadian beliefs considered together, and for the three general beliefs considered together. The scores were of two types: a "difference score" was the value obtained by subtracting from each other the ratings given to the members of a pair -- the larger the difference, the larger the discrimination, and an "absolute score," which is simply the rating from 1 to 9 circled by the subject.

⁸Rokeach and Rothman argue strongly that the total configuration of the characterized subject will be ". . . more or less completely assimilated. . ." (1965, p. 132) by characterization of the subject such that the characterization of the subject will be the basis for making any discrimination about that subject.

More specifically the following scores were computed for the three general issues and for the three English-Canadian - French-Canadian issues:

(1) E difference score: an ethnic group score representing the total differences in ratings given to French-Canadians as compared to English-Canadians, when belief is held constant (Type E pairs); the larger the score the greater the preference for French-Canadians over English-Canadians.

(2) B difference score: a belief score representing the total differences in ratings given to those who agree as compared to those who disagree with the subject, when ethnic group is held constant (Type B pairs); the larger the score, the greater the preference for those who agree.

(3) EB difference score: an ethnic group - belief score representing the total absolute differences in ratings given to pairs (Type EB) in which both ethnic group and belief are varied.

(4) FCN: the total absolute score given FC holding the same belief preferences as the subject; the larger the score the greater the preference.

(5) fcn: the total absolute score given FC holding beliefs contrary to those professed by the subject; the greater the score the greater the preference.

(6) ECN: the total absolute score given EC holding the same belief preferences as the subject; the larger the score the greater

the preference.

(7) ecn: the total absolute score given EC holding beliefs contrary to those professed by the subject; the larger the score the larger the preference.

In every case, the decision that the subject was "for" or "against" a belief was made by noting where he stands on each issue, as determined by responses to a questionnaire which was given at the beginning of the test period.

(2) Opinionation

The Opinionation Scale is a measure of general intolerance. The specific ideological content of the scale is balanced by wording half the items in such a way that agreement with them indicates "left opinionation" and by wording the other half of the items in such a way that agreement with them indicates "right opinionation." Rokeach (1960, p. 81) defines "left" and "right" not in terms of extremist orientations but in terms of left of center or right of center.

The Canadian version of the Opinionation scale, listed in the Appendix, developed by Peters (1961) was used in an abridged version consisting of 11 items measuring "right opinionation" and 11 items measuring "left opinionation." The abridgement was decided upon because the nature of the political and social issues sampled would seem to make the scale lose its actuality and fitness for use within a

relatively short period of time (Rubenowitz, 1963, p. 91). Only those items from Peters' Canadian version of the Opinionation scale which were judged likely to be clearly understood and salient for high school students were retained in our abridged version of the scale.

Four scores have been derived from this scale:

- (1) Right Opinionation.
- (2) Left Opinionation.
- (3) Total Opinionation (1 + 2).
- (4) Conservatism-liberalism (right opinionation minus left opinionation), high scores indicating liberalism, and low scores indicating conservatism.

(3) Rigidity Flexibility

This was measured by using the California Psychological Inventory Flexibility scale. This scale is a measure of a person's degree of flexibility and adaptability in thinking and social behaviour. In the CPI, responses to the 22 items are of the true-false type, but the Likert method of scaling was chosen for this investigation (Rubenowitz, 1963, p. 83). Low scores will indicate a high degree of flexibility and high scores will indicate a low degree of flexibility.

Scoring of the data and the calculation of all descriptive

statistics⁹ was carried out on the IBM 7040 computer. A "t" test program, a correlation program, and four scoring programs, modified by the author, and available by courtesy of the Department of Educational Psychology were used.

⁹Differences between means of correlated measures were tested using the "t" test procedure suggested by Ferguson (1959, pp. 136-140). Winer's (1962, pp. 36-39) procedure for testing differences between means when sample variances are not equal was used when required.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

(1) Belief Patterns

In the first part of our questionnaire all subjects were asked to indicate whether they were "for" or "against" each of the six issues, presented below, which were used as subject characterizations in the questionnaire proper.

<u>HOW DO YOU STAND WITH RESPECT TO:</u>	<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
1. Believing in democracy	_____	_____
2. Believing in God	_____	_____
3. Believing in Communism	_____	_____
4. Believing that French should be taught to all school children, beginning in kindergarten	_____	_____
5. Believing that Quebec could get along quite well without the rest of Canada	_____	_____
6. Believing that it is good to respect and uphold the traditions and heritage of our ancestors	_____	_____

The components and distributions of a surprisingly wide range of belief patterns are presented in:

- (a) Table I for the French-Canadian Urban Sample.
- (b) Table II for the French-Canadian Rural-Urban Sample.
- (c) Table III for the French-Canadian Rural Sample.
- (d) Table IV for the English-Canadian Sample.

TABLE I

COMPONENTS* AND DISTRIBUTION OF BELIEF PATTERNS
FOR THE FRENCH-CANADIAN URBAN SAMPLE

Pattern	N	Males	Females	GENERAL ISSUES			SPECIFIC ISSUES		
				1 "Democracy"	2 "God"	3 "Communism"	4 "French"	5 "Quebec"	6 "Tradition"
1	70	28	42	1	1	0	1	0	1
2	14	6	8	1	1	0	1	0	0
3	12	5	7	1	1	0	1	1	1
4	5	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
5	1	1		1	1	0	1	1	0
6	2		2	1	1	0	0	0	0
7	2		2	1	1	1	1	0	0
8	6	4	2	1	1	1	1	0	1
9	4	3	1	1	1	0	0	1	0
V				0	1	1	0	1	0
W				0	1	0	1	0	1
X				1	1	0	0	1	1
Y				1	1	1	0	0	0
Z				1	1	1	0	0	0

*Belief pattern components are determined by the stand taken on each of the six issues presented.

In this table "1" means "FOR" and "0" means "AGAINST" the issue in question.

TABLE II

COMPONENTS* AND DISTRIBUTION OF BELIEF PATTERNS
FOR THE FRENCH-CANADIAN RURAL-URBAN

Pattern	N	Males	Females	GENERAL ISSUES			SPECIFIC ISSUES		
				1 "Democracy"	2 "God"	3 "Communism"	4 "French"	5 "Quebec"	6 "Tradition"
1	42	22	20	1	1	0	1	0	1
2	11	8	3	1	1	0	1	0	0
3	16	1	5	1	1	0	1	1	1
4	3	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
5	2		2	1	1	0	1	1	0
6	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
7	1	1		1	1	1	1	0	0
8				1	1	1	1	0	1
9				1	1	0	0	1	0
V				0	1	1	0	1	0
W				0	1	0	1	0	1
X				1	1	0	0	1	1
Y				0	1	1	1	0	1
Z				1	1	1	0	0	0

*Belief pattern components are determined by the stand taken on each of the six issues presented.

In this table "1" means "FOR" and "0" means "AGAINST" the issue in question.

TABLE III

COMPONENTS* AND DISTRIBUTION OF BELIEF PATTERNS
FOR THE FRENCH-CANADIAN RURAL SAMPLE

Pattern	N	Males	Females	GENERAL ISSUES			SPECIFIC ISSUES		
				1 "Democracy"	2 "God"	3 "Communism"	4 "French"	5 "Quebec"	6 "Tradition"
1	76	33	43	1	1	0	1	0	1
2	12	2	10	1	1	0	1	0	0
3	25	12	13	1	1	0	1	1	1
4	5	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	1
5	8	5	3	1	1	0	1	1	0
6				1	1	0	0	0	0
7				1	1	1	1	0	0
8				1	1	1	1	0	1
9				1	1	0	0	1	0
V				0	1	1	0	1	0
W	1		1	0	1	0	1	0	1
X	1		1	1	1	0	0	1	1
Y	1		1	0	1	1	1	0	1
Z	1		1	1	1	1	0	0	0

*Belief pattern components are determined by the stand taken on each of the six issues presented.

In this table "1" means "FOR" and "0" means "AGAINST" the issue in question.

TABLE IV

COMPONENTS* AND DISTRIBUTION OF BELIEF PATTERNS
FOR THE ENGLISH-CANADIAN SAMPLE

Pattern	N	Males	Females	GENERAL ISSUES				SPECIFIC ISSUES		
				1 "Democracy"	2 "God"	3 "Communism"	4 "French"	5 "Quebec"	6 "Tradition"	
1	48	14	34	1	1	0	1	0	1	
2	24	18	6	1	1	0	1	0	0	
3	5		5	1	1	0	1	1	1	
4	19	9	10	1	1	0	0	0	1	
5	3	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	
6	6	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	
7				1	1	1	1	0	0	
8				1	1	1	1	0	1	
9	4	3	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	
V				0	1	1	0	1	0	
W				0	1	0	1	0	1	
X	3	2	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	
Y				0	1	1	1	0	1	
Z	1	1		1	1	1	0	0	0	

*Belief pattern components are determined by the stand taken on each of the six issues presented.

In this table "1" means "FOR" and "0" means "AGAINST" the issue in question.

(2) Reliability of the Data

Our first analysis was concerned with assessing the reliability of the discrimination ratings obtained from the ethnic-belief difference scores. Six pairs of stimulus items are presented here to demonstrate the manner in which various ethnic and belief difference scores can be obtained indirectly from pairs not specifically constructed for this purpose.

TYPE E PAIRS: Ethnic group varied, belief held constant

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. An English-Canadian who believes in God | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |
| 2. A French-Canadian who believes in God | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |
| 3. An English-Canadian who does not believe in God | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |
| 4. A French-Canadian who does not believe in God | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

TYPE B PAIRS: Belief varied, ethnic group held constant

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 5. A French-Canadian who does not believe in God | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |
| 6. A French-Canadian who believes in God | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |
| 7. An English-Canadian who does not believe in God | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |
| 8. An English-Canadian who believes in God | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

TYPE EB PAIRS: Ethnic group varied, belief varied

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| 9. A French-Canadian who does not believe in God | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |
| 10. An English-Canadian who believes in God | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |
| 11. An English-Canadian who does not believe in God | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |
| 12. A French-Canadian who believes in God | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

As shown, all members of Type E pairs are repeated again in Type B pairs, and again in Type EB pairs but in different permutations and combinations. Thus, an ethnic group difference-score can be obtained directly from the members of a given Type E pair and indirectly from the identical members found in Type B or Type EB pairs. For example, it can be seen from the stimulus items presented above that an ethnic group difference-score derived directly from a Type E pair is (1-2) plus (3-4). A second ethnic group difference-score can be obtained indirectly from Type B pairs; that is (5-7) plus (6-8). A third such score derived from Type EB pairs is (9-11) plus (10-12). These three scores are in effect all ethnic group difference-scores derived from the same basic material since each single member of a pair is repeated with a different partner in each of the three types of pairs.

In precisely the same manner, a belief difference-score can be obtained either directly from Type B pairs, or indirectly from Type E or Type EB pairs.

Three ethnic group and three belief difference-scores were computed for each person, following the procedure outlined above. The reliability of the scores thus obtained was determined by inter-correlating these three scores and assessing the significance of the resulting correlation coefficients. The complete results are shown in Table V.

The reliabilities of the belief difference-scores are uniformly

TABLE V

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR DIFFERENCE SCORES ON SPECIFIC AND GENERAL BELIEFS

Correlating:	Group!	N	Specific Beliefs			General Beliefs		
			Total Group	Males	Females	Total Group	Males	Females
E _e and E _b **	F-C Urban	116	.227 ¹	.160*	.314	.426	.624	.367 ¹
	F-C Rur-Urb.	67	.184*	.015	.497	.174*	.149*	.255 ¹
	F-C Rural	130	.299	.394	.250	-.072*	.101	-.141*
	E-C	113	.309	.405	.186*	.091*	.252	-.056*
E _e and E _{eb}	F-C Urban	116	.264	.194 ¹	.339	.319	.365	.368
	F-C Rur-Urb.	67	.258 ¹	.288 ¹	.204*	.250 ¹	.358	.278 ¹
	F-C Rural	130	.073*	.051*	.104	.182 ¹	.371	.099*
	E-C	113	.270	.194 ¹	.358	.148	-.136*	.326
B _b and B _e	F-C Urban	116	.831	.851	.816	.877	.843	.906
	F-C Rur-Urb.	67	.798	.779	.820	.776	.794	.771
	F-C Rural	130	.790	.699	.835	.729	.759	.699
	E-C	113	.853	.882	.827	.887	.933	.829
B _b and B _{eb}	F-C Urban	116	.849	.903	.796	.922	.908	.942
	F-C Rur-Urb.	67	.744	.736	.752	.914	.898	.940
	F-C Rural	130	.795	.737	.824	.859	.834	.870
	E-C	113	.884	.888	.881	.944	.949	.933

¹F-C means French-Canadian; E-C means English-Canadian; Rur-Urb. means Rural-Urban.

*These are the only reliability coefficients which are non-significant.

1-p > .05 for all other reliability coefficients shown p > .01.

**The subscript "e" indicates that the score was derived from Type E pairs (ethnic group varied, belief constant); the subscript "b" indicates that the score was derived from Type B pairs (belief varied, ethnic group constant); the subscript "eb" indicates that the score was derived from Type EB pairs (ethnic group and belief varied).

very high, ranging from .699 to .949, both significant at greater than the .001 level of confidence. However, the reliabilities of the ethnic group difference scores present a puzzling picture. Although 21 reliability coefficients are significant at greater than the .01 level of confidence and 9 others are significant at beyond the .05 level of confidence, 18 reliability coefficients are non-significant. It is noted in Table V that all reliability coefficients for ethnic difference-scores are markedly lower than those which were derived for belief difference-scores. How is this marked disparity to be interpreted? It is possible that responses to the questionnaire items were made in a careless, slipshod, almost random manner. However, the highly significant reliabilities of the belief difference-scores, militates strongly against this reply.

A cautiously advanced explanation, consistent with the present theory, is that the ethnic group (subject) is not used as a salient discrimination factor to the same extent as belief (subject characterization) is used. This view supports the major hypothesis of the present study and is consistent with data to be presented later in this chapter which indicate that discrimination responses are made primarily on the basis of belief.

(3) Analysis of the Data

The validity of the main hypothesis can be assessed from several types of analyses.

1. To what degree are race and belief determining discrimination-

responses. If discrimination-responses to Type EB pairs (ethnic group and belief varied) are due principally to ethnic group factors, then such responses should correlate highly with ethnic group discrimination responses (Type E), but not with belief discrimination responses (Type B). Alternatively, if discrimination responses to Type EB pairs are due principally to belief, then these responses should correlate highly with belief (Type B) but not with ethnic group (Type E) discrimination-responses. The results of this analysis are presented in Table VI.

The results shown in these tables indicate clearly that Type EB discrimination responses are very highly correlated with belief (Type B) discrimination responses and only negligibly correlated with ethnic group (Type E) discrimination responses. The correlation of Type EB discrimination responses with Type E responses is non-significant for all groups except the English-Canadian male sample, which has a correlation significant at the .05 level. There is an indication here that ethnic group affiliation does influence discrimination responses. However this is far outweighed by the very highly significant correlations between Type EB responses and Type B responses for this group. The results show that discriminatory responses are made primarily on the basis of belief with ethnic group playing a relatively minor role in all instances.

Sex differences in respect of correlations between discrimination responses, when both ethnic group and belief were varied

TABLE VI

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DISCRIMINATION RESPONSES,
WHEN BOTH ETHNIC GROUP AND BELIEF ARE VARIED
(TYPE EB), AND ETHNIC DISCRIMINATION (TYPE E)
AND BELIEF DISCRIMINATION (TYPE B) RESPONSES

Correlation between Ethnic - Belief (EB) difference score AND:	Group*	N	Specific beliefs	General beliefs
Ethnic (e) difference score	F-C Urban	116	.040	-.098
	F-C Rural-Urban	67	-.047	-.061
	F-C Rural	130	.060	.027
	E-C	113	.170	.125
Belief (B)** difference score	F-C Urban	116	.944	.939
	F-C Rural-Urban	67	.837	.924
	F-C Rural	130	.850	.879
	E-C	113	.922	.955

*F-C means French-Canadian, E-C means English-Canadian.

**All correlations between EB and B difference scores are highly significant $p > .01$.

(Type EB) and ethnic-discrimination (Type E) and belief-discrimination (Type B) responses were non-significant.

2. The preceding analysis has strongly indicated that discriminatory responses are made primarily in terms of belief congruence rather than in terms of ethnic group affiliation. If this is the case, then those who agree should be preferred to those who disagree, be they French-Canadian or English-Canadian. The results overwhelmingly support this conjecture. Any further comment on these results must await consideration of the effect of belief pattern distributions.

In an attempt to preserve the unique elements of those belief patterns which are held by a minority of our total sample the four samples have been divided⁹ into two groups, a common belief-pattern group and an unique belief-pattern group. Membership in the former group was arbitrarily decided upon by selecting all those subjects who adhere to belief patterns held by 10 or more individuals in any one sample. Those subjects not so selected became the members of the latter group.

The complete results relating to, (1) the mean acceptance of French-Canadians and English-Canadians when belief is held constant, and (2) the mean acceptance of those who agree and those who disagree when ethnic group is held constant, are presented in:

⁹This precaution was taken to avoid the virtual disappearance of the variance contributed by small groups. Ferguson (1959, p. 61) shows that the variance contributed by any group to the total variance for combined groups is a direct function of group size.

(a) Table VII for common belief pattern groups.

(b) Table VIII for unique belief pattern groups.

The results show that for both belief pattern groups there is no significant difference between the mean degree of acceptance shown for French-Canadians and the mean degree of acceptance shown for English-Canadians. These findings strongly suggest that subjects did not discriminate on the basis of ethnic affiliation. What then is the basis for discriminatory choices? The impressively large and very significant differences between mean acceptances of those who agree and those who disagree, observed for both belief pattern groups (Tables VII and VIII), suggest that congruence of beliefs is an extremely important factor regulating discriminatory choices.¹⁰

3. Discrimination on an ethnic basis implies that the outgroup is discriminated against whereas the ingroup is favoured.¹¹ Levinson (1949) suggests that the concept of ethnocentrism refers to vilification of the outgroup and glorification of the ingroup. If this is the case we should expect to find a negative relation between rejection of French-Canadians and rejection of English-Canadians--the more the French-Canadians are rejected, the more the English-Canadians are

¹⁰It should be noted that mean acceptance scores for French-Canadians versus English-Canadians were derived with belief held constant, and the agree versus disagree comparisons were obtained with ethnic group held constant.

¹¹In this study the ingroup for all French-speaking Canadians sampled is assumed to consist of French-Canadian stimulus persons presented in the questionnaire items, while the outgroup consists of English-Canadian stimulus persons presented in the questionnaire items. An exactly opposite situation is assumed for the English-speaking Canadians sampled.

TABLE VII

MEAN ACCEPTANCE OF FRENCH-CANADIANS AND ENGLISH-CANADIANS
WITH BELIEF HELD CONSTANT, AND MEAN ACCEPTANCE OF
THOSE WHO AGREE AND THOSE WHO DISAGREE WITH
ETHNIC GROUP HELD CONSTANT, FOR GROUPS
MANIFESTING COMMON BELIEF PATTERNS

Rating Group**	Rated Group	SPECIFIC BELIEFS			GENERAL BELIEFS		
		Mean	S.D.	Diff.*	Mean	S.D.	Diff.
F-C Urban	F-C (FCN, fcn)	49.80	7.90	.36	47.32	7.02	.55
	E-C (ECN, ecn)	50.16	8.13		47.87	6.95	
F-C Rural- Urban	F-C (FCN, fcn)	48.14	6.01	.42	47.26	5.46	1.21
	E-C (ECN, ecn)	48.66	5.98		45.95	5.40	
F-C Rural	F-C (FCN, fcn)	50.79	7.96	.25	47.46	7.89	1.05
	E-C (ECN, ecn)	51.04	8.02		46.41	8.03	
E-C	F-C (FCN, fcn)	49.53	11.68	1.17	49.22	9.26	.43
	E-C (ECN, ecn)	50.70	11.59		49.65	8.10	
F-C Urban	PRO (FCN, ECN)	67.11	8.01	36.25	70.94	9.00	46.23
	CON (fcn, ecn)	33.86	13.48		24.71	12.31	
F-C Rural- Urban	PRO (FCN, ECN)	65.49	10.76	39.57	73.14	11.77	53.03
	CON (fcn, ecn)	25.92	11.19		20.11	11.93	
F-C Rural	PRO (FCN, ECN)	67.70	9.78	33.58	71.48	10.33	50.01
	CON (fcn, ecn)	34.12	12.42		21.47	11.86	
E-C	PRO (FCN, ECN)	66.94	8.77	31.07	75.87	6.21	54.51
	CON (fcn, ecn)	35.87	18.92		21.46	15.13	

*Significance levels are determined by "t" tests for correlated measures. It should be noted that the sum or means for French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians is only approximately equal to the sum of the means for agree and disagree since the former are computed from Type E pairs, while the latter are computed from Type B. pairs.

**F-C means French-speaking Canadian, E-C means English-speaking Canadian.
Agree has been abbreviated to "PRO," and disagree has been abbreviated to "CON."

TABLE VIII

MEAN ACCEPTANCE OF FRENCH-CANADIANS AND ENGLISH-CANADIANS
WITH BELIEF HELD CONSTANT, AND MEAN ACCEPTANCE OF
THOSE WHO AGREE AND THOSE WHO DISAGREE WITH
ETHNIC GROUP HELD CONSTANT, FOR GROUPS
MANIFESTING UNIQUE BELIEF PATTERNS

Rating Group**	Rated Group	SPECIFIC BELIEFS			GENERAL BELIEFS		
		Mean	S.D.	Diff.*	Mean	S.D.	Diff.
F-C Urban	F-C (FCN,fcn)	54.61	7.46	.39	49.54	9.11	1.22
	E-C (ECN,ecn)	55.02	9.49		48.32	5.47	
F-C Rural- Urban	F-C (FCN,fcn)	48.96	7.45	.18	49.31	5.33	.44
	E-C (ECN,ecn)	48.78	8.33		48.87	6.71	
F-C Rural	F-C (FCN,fcn)	52.31	8.32	.37	51.38	7.53	.14
	E-C (ECN,ecn)	51.94	7.14		51.24	7.71	
E-C	F-C (FCN,fcn)	48.96	11.71	.58	49.41	9.91	.95
	E-C (ECN,ecn)	49.54	12.04		50.36	8.43	
F-C Urban	PRO (FCN,ECN)	74.39	5.41	42.99	71.33	7.44	49.21
	CON (fcn,ecn)	31.40	12.67		22.12	10.01	
F-C Rural- Urban	PRO (FCN,ECN)	67.51	11.27	45.12	73.29	11.84	49.74
	CON (fcn,ecn)	22.39	9.75		24.55	12.33	
F-C Rural	PRO (FCN,ECN)	68.55	8.44	35.08	72.48	10.07	49.21
	CON (fcn,ecn)	33.47	11.79		23.27	11.91	
E-C	PRO (FCN,ECN)	65.39	9.61	30.67	75.02	5.98	50.06
	CON (fcn,ecn)	34.72	14.87		24.96	15.76	

*Significance levels are determined by "t" tests for correlated measures. It should be noted that the sum of means for French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians is only approximately equal to the sum of the means for agree and disagree since the former are computed from Type E pairs, while the latter are computed from Type B pairs.

**F-C means French-speaking Canadian, E-C means English-speaking Canadian.

Agree has been abbreviated to "PRO," and disagree has been abbreviated to "CON."

accepted. This describes the situation for the English-speaking Canadian sample. Obviously the converse of this description applies to the French-speaking Canadian sample. This might be labelled reciprocal ethnic discrimination between French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians if our results supported these statements. The results¹² relating to (1) correlations between the acceptance of French-Canadians and English-Canadians and (2) correlations between the acceptance of those who agree and those who disagree are shown in:

(a) Table IX for common belief pattern groups.

(b) Table X for unique belief pattern groups.

The results¹³ clearly show that the greater the rejection of French-Canadians, the greater also the rejection of English-Canadians. This is true for all samples in both belief pattern groups. In light of these results it becomes difficult to talk psychologically of ethnic discrimination if those who reject French-Canadians also reject English-Canadians.

To what extent is the acceptance of those who agree with us related to acceptance of those who disagree with us? For all samples

¹²It should be noted that all the precautions taken in the preceding analysis to ensure the retention of the unique elements in those belief patterns held by a minority of our total sample, have also been repeated in this analysis.

¹³The correlation coefficients for common and unique groups were averaged using the procedure involving Fishers Z coefficients suggested by Guilford (1956, p. 325-326).

TABLE IX

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ACCEPTANCE OF FRENCH-CANADIANS
AND ENGLISH-CANADIANS, AND CORRELATIONS BETWEEN
ACCEPTANCE OF THOSE WHO AGREE AND THOSE WHO
DISAGREE, FOR COMMON BELIEF PATTERN GROUPS

Correlation between Acceptance of:	Group*	Specific Beliefs	General Beliefs
	F-C Urban	.906	.973
F-C (FCN, fcn) and E-C (ECN, ecn)	F-C Rural-Urban	.790	.647
	F-C Rural	.841	.815
	E-C	.881	.935
	F-C Urban	-.001	.180
Those who agree (FCN, ECN) and disagree (fcn, ecn)	F-C Rural-Urban	.125	.231
	F-C Rural	.073	.083
	E-C	-.183	-.181

* F-C means French-speaking Canadian, E-C means English-speaking Canadian.

TABLE X

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ACCEPTANCE OF FRENCH-CANADIANS
AND ENGLISH-CANADIANS, AND CORRELATIONS BETWEEN
ACCEPTANCE OF THOSE WHO AGREE AND THOSE WHO
DISAGREE, FOR UNIQUE BELIEF PATTERN GROUPS

Correlation between Acceptance of:	Group*	Specific Beliefs	General Beliefs
	F-C Urban	.903	.986
F-C (FCN, fcn) and	F-C Rural-Urban	.760	.954
E-C (ECN, ecn)	F-C Rural	.725	.897
	E-C	.940	.975
	F-C Urban	-.675	-.645
Those who agree (FCN, ECN) and	F-C Rural-Urban	-.825	-.780
disagree (fcn, ecn)	F-C Rural	.085	-.430
	E-C	.509	-.329

* F-C means French-speaking Canadian, E-C means English-speaking Canadian.

holding common belief patterns the relationship between the two variables is negligible. With the exception of F-C rural and E-C groups the results for all groups holding unique belief-patterns validate the hypothesis that in the matter of specific and general beliefs extent of acceptance of those who agree with us is markedly correlated with extent of rejection of those who disagree with us. With regard to specific beliefs these two variables do not appear to be related for the F-C rural sample. However, a significant positive correlation exists between these variables for the English-speaking Canadian sample. This would appear to suggest that specific belief issues are not salient sources of discrimination for these two samples.

4. The extent of belief dissonance is indicated in the Type B and Type EB scores but not in the Type E scores. To what extent is this related to (1) rigidity measured by the CPI Flexibility-Rigidity Scale, and (2) general intolerance of the beliefs of others, measured by the Opinionation Scale? The results are shown in Table XI. Highly significant positive correlations were found between intolerance of the beliefs of others (Opinionation) and Type B (Belief) discrimination responses and Type EB (Ethnic-Belief) discrimination responses. These findings lend strong support both to the main hypothesis and to the minor hypothesis relating intolerance of beliefs to belief incongruence (supra, p. 12). Sex differences, with respect to the correlation of flexibility-rigidity and opinionation with Type E, Type B and Type EB difference scores, were non-significant.

TABLE XI

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FLEXIBILITY-RIGIDITY AND OPINIONATION
SCORES AND TYPE E, TYPE B, AND TYPE EB DIFFERENCE SCORES

Scales	Group**	Type E (Ethnic Group)		Type B (Belief)		Type EB (Ethnic Belief)	
		Difference Score Specific Belief	General Belief	Difference Score Specific Belief	General Belief	Difference Score Specific Belief	General Belief
CPI	F-C Urban	.071	.033	.137	.130	.162	.154
	F-C Rur-Urb.	.127	.097	.201	.193	.187	.163
	F-C Rural	.119	.102	.164	.189	.170	.181
	E-C	.069	.045	.099	.116	.125	.130
Canadian Opinionation Scale	F-C Urban	.114	.098	.313*	.362*	.297*	.314*
	F-C Rur-Urb.	.204	.211	.248*	.251*	.240*	.244*
	F-C Rural	.186	.175	.311*	.297*	.302*	.255*
	E-C	.195	.170	.425*	.374*	.379*	.326*

**F-C means French-speaking Canadian, E-C means English-speaking Canadian.

*Very significant $p > .01$

There is no support for the minor hypothesis (supra, p. 12) stating that rigidity is related to belief incongruence.

No consistently-significant differences in performance on every variable were found between French-speaking and English-speaking Canadian subjects. These findings would appear to indicate that there is some basis in fact for saying that French-Canadians in the West are "Westerners" in all respects with the exception that they speak French. We must stress, however, that this study was not designed to specifically test this hypothesis, consequently the findings, although interesting, must be regarded as extremely tentative indications of the validity of this view.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The main hypothesis, that French-speaking Canadians and English-speaking Canadians perceive each other not in terms of ethnic or racial categories but in terms of the extent to which the belief systems of the other party are congruent with their own, was validated. The minor hypothesis, that the extent of belief incongruence claimed by French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians is related to their intolerance of the beliefs of others, was also validated. Therefore, by implication, the general theory from which the hypotheses were derived, was sustained.

One main educational implication of these findings concerns the effect of intolerant attitudes on the efficiency of second language learning. According to Lambert (1963, p. 114) one of the principal factors promoting the satisfactory acquisition of a second language is an integrative orientation to that language. An integrative orientation is defined by Lambert as a desire to know more about the second-language group and to ultimately become a member of that group. It is inferred by Lambert (1963, p. 115) that this integrative orientation owes its origins to (1) the favourable emphasis placed by first-language parents on certain aspects of the second-language culture, and (2) parental reinforcement of the child's behaviour which is congruent with this emphasis. Lambert maintains

that

proper orientation toward the other group is developed within the family: students with an integrative disposition to learn French had parents who also were integrative and sympathetic to the French community. The students' orientations were not related to parents' skill in French, nor to the number of French acquaintances the parents had, indicating that the integrative motive is not due to having more experience with French at home but more likely stems from a family-wide attitudinal disposition (1963, p. 116)

Lambert makes no attempt to ascertain the reasons behind the adoption of these favourable attitudes by the parents. The findings of the present study indicate that those parents who foster a favourable attitude towards the learning of a second language by their children probably perceive the second-language group as having beliefs similar to their own or beliefs which they would like to adopt.

Since a favourable attitude towards the second-language group appears to foster more rapid and effective learning of that second language (Gardner and Lambert, 1959; Lambert, Gardner, Barik and Tunstall, 1963), an important problem to be dealt with in the teaching of a second language would seem to be concerned with the engendering of favourable attitudes towards the second-language group in prospective and present learners of the second language.

How is this to be brought about? An increased and freer intercourse between first-language and second-language group members would permit first-language members to develop a more exact concept of the beliefs of those members of the second-language group with

whom they are interacting. Then, as an increasing number of beliefs are discovered to be similar, favourable attitudes should develop and increase. This is the conclusion drawn by Stein, Hardyck, and Smith (1965) from a study of racial attitudes and preferences of Grade 9 students.

When subjects are forced to evaluate stimulus individuals in terms of their beliefs, then belief congruence is more important than race. But when the belief component is not provided, spelled out in considerable detail, subjects will react in racial terms on the basis of assumptions concerning the belief systems of others, and of emotional or institutionalized factors. The practical implications of these results are obvious. If people of different races encounter one another under conditions favouring the perception of belief congruence (as, for example, in equal-status contacts) then racial prejudice should be substantially reduced (1965, p. 289).

This position - and the present writer's - is consonant with Anderson's (1965) decision concerning the most effective sort of second language learning by children living in a monoglot culture.

Both from the cognitive and motivational standpoint, then, some early coordinate training in L2 (second-language) is desirable based on, or accompanied by, contact with L2 (second language) natives and their life style. The learning of L2 (second language) will be improved and any disagreement will be based on dissonance of beliefs and not on unreal stereotypes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ainsworth, L. H. Rigidity, insecurity and stress. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 67-74.
- Allport, G. W. The nature of prejudice. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Anderson, C. C. Psychological contributions to education: A decision concerning second-language learning in the elementary school. Unpublished manuscript, 1965.
- Andreas, B. G. Experimental psychology. New York: Wiley, 1960.
- Anisfeld, Elizabeth and Lambert, W. E. Evaluational reactions of bilingual and monolingual children to spoken languages. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 89-97.
- Anisfeld, Moshe and Lambert, Wallace E. Social and psychological variables in learning Hebrew. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961,
- Anisfeld, M., Munoz, S. R. and Lambert, W. E. The structure and dynamics of the ethnic attitudes of Jewish adolescents. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 1, 31-36.
- Barron, F. Complexity-simplicity as a personality dimension. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 163-172.
- Birren, J. E. (Editor). Handbook of aging and the individual. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Bruner, Jerome S. The course of cognitive growth. American Psychologist, 1964, 19, 1-15.
- Byrne, D. Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 713-715.
- Byrne, D. and Wong, T. J. Racial prejudice, interpersonal attraction, and assumed dissimilarity of attitudes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 246-253.
- Dawes, R. M. Social selection based on multi-dimensional criteria. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 1, 104-109.
- Edwards, A. L. Statistical methods for the behavioural sciences. New York: Rinehart, 1954.
- Ellis, A. Reason and emotion in psychotherapy. New York: Lyle Stuart, 1963.
- Ervin, Susan M. Language and TAT content in bilinguals. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 500-507.

- Ervin, S. M. and Osgood, C. E. Second language learning and bilingualism. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 139-146.
- Ferguson, G. A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Feshback, S. and Singer, R. D. The effects of fear arousal and suppression of fear upon social perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 283-288.
- Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957.
- Fishbein, M. An investigation of the relationship between beliefs about an object and the attitude toward that object. Human Relations, 1963, 16 (3), 233-239.
- Foa, U. G. Cross cultural similarity and difference in interpersonal behaviour. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 517-522.
- Frenkel-Brunswik, Else. A study of prejudice in children. Human Relations, 1948, 1, 295-306.
- Gardner, R. C. and Lambert, W. E. Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 1959, 13, 266-272.
- Garrett, H. E. Statistics in psychology and education. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1958.
- Goodstein, L. D. Intellectual rigidity and social attitudes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 345-353.
- Gough, H. G. The California psychological inventory. Consulting Psychologist Press, 1957.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Haugen, E. The bilingual individual. In Sol Saporta and J. R. Bastian (Eds.). Psycholinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, 395-407.
- Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Jakobovits, L. and Lambert, W. E. Semantic satiation among bilinguals. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1961, 62, 576-582.

- Katz, D. and Stotland, E. A preliminary statement to a theory of attitude structure and change. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: a study of a science, Vol. 3. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Keehn, I. D. and Prothro, E. T. National preferences of university students from 23 nations. Journal of Psychology, 1956, 42, 283-294.
- Kemp, G. C. and Kohler, L. J. Suitability of the Rokeach dogmatism scale for high school use. Journal of Experimental Education, 1965, 33, #4.
- Klineberg, O. The UNESCO project on international tensions: a challenge to the sciences of man. UNESCO International Social Science Bulletin, 1949, 1, (1-2) 11-21 and 88-89.
- Kounin, I. S. The meaning of rigidity: a reply to Heinz Werner. Psychological Review, 1948, 55, 157-166.
- Krech, D., Crutchfield R. S. and Ballachey, E. L. Individual in society. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Kutner, B. Patterns of mental functioning associated with prejudice in children. Psychological Monograph, 1958, 72, No. 7 (Whole No. 460).
- Lambert, W. E. Psychological approaches to the study of languages. Modern Languages Journal, 1963, 47, 51-62, 114-121.
- Lambert, W. E., Gardner, R. C., Barik, H. C., and Tunstall, K. Attitudinal and cognitive aspects of intensive study of a second language. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 358-368.
- Lambert, W. E., Havelka, J. and Crosby, C. The influence of language acquisition contexts on bilingualism. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 339-344.
- Lambert, W. E., Havelka, J. and Gardner, R. C. Linguistic manifestations of bilingualism. American Journal of Psychology, 1959, 72, 77-82.
- Lambert, W. E. and Jakobovits, L. A. Verbal satiation and changes in the intensity of meaning. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1960, 60, 376-383.
- Lambert, W. E. and Klineberg, O. A pilot study of the origin and development of national stereotypes. International Social Science Journal, 1959, 11, 221-238.
- Lambert, W. E. and Yeni-Komshian, G. Concurrent and consecutive modes of learning two vocabularies. Unpublished manuscript, 1963.

- Laurendeau, A., Dunton, A. D. et al. Commission royale d'enquête sur le bilinguisme et le biculturalisme. Ottawa: Imprimeur de la Reine, 1965.
- Levinson, D. J. An approach to the theory and measurement of ethnocentric ideology. Journal of Psychology, 1949, 28, 19-39.
- Luchins, A. S. Rigidity and ethnocentrism: a critique. Journal of Personality, 1949, 17, 449-466.
- Métraux, R. and Mead, M. Themes in French culture. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.
- Neuringer, L. The relationship between authoritarianism, rigidity and anxiety. Journal of General Psychology, 1964, 71, 169-175.
- Organick, E. I. A Fortran primer. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley, 1963.
- Peal, Elizabeth, and Lambert, W. E. The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. Psychological Monograph, 1962, 76 (27, Whole No. 546).
- Peters, H. B. An experimental application of the concepts of image and plans to the counselling setting. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, 1961, University of Alberta, Library.
- Pettigrew, T. F. Personality and sociocultural factors in inter-group attitudes, a cross national comparison. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1958, 2, 29-42.
- Prasad, J. Group-involvement in the causation of group tension. Indian Journal of Psychology, 1953, 28, 1-14.
- Prothro, E. T. Cross-cultural patterns of national stereotypes. Journal of Social Psychology, 1954, 40, 39-42.
- Prothro, E. T. and Keehn, J. D. Stereotypes and Semantic space. Journal of Social Psychology, 1957, 45, 197-209.
- Prothro, E. T. and Melikian, L. H. Studies in stereotypes: V: Familiarity and the kernel of truth hypothesis. Journal of Social Psychology, 1955, 41, 3-10.
- Riestra, M. A. and Johnson, C. E. Changes in attitude of elementary school pupils toward foreign-speaking people resulting from the study of a foreign language. Journal of Experimental Education, 1964, 33, 65-72.
- Rokeach, M. Generalized mental rigidity as a factor in ethnocentrism. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1948, 43, 259-278.
- _____. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

- Rokeach, M. Belief versus race as determinants of social distance: comment on Triandis' paper. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 187-188.
- Rokeach, M. and Rothman, G. The principle of belief congruence and the congruity principle as models of cognitive interaction. Psychological Review, 1965, 72, 128-142.
- Rubenowitz, S. Emotional flexibility-rigidity as a comprehensive dimension of mind. PA Council Report NR34, 1963.
- Samelson, F. Agreement set and anticontent attitudes in the F scale. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, #3, 338-342.
- Sarason, I. G. A note on anxiety, instructions and word association performance, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 153-154.
- Secord, P. F., and Backman, C. W. Personality theory and the problem of stability and change in individual behaviour: An interpersonal approach. In Harper, R. J. C., Anderson, C. C., Christensen, C. M. and Hunka, S. M. (Eds.), The cognitive processes. Prentice-Hall, 1964, 538-551.
- Stein, D. D., Hardyck, Jane A., and Smith, M. B. Race and belief: an open and shut case. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 281-289.
- Triandis, H. C. A note on Rokeach's theory of prejudice. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 184-186.
- Triandis, H. E. and Fishbein, M. Cognitive interaction in person perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, #5, 446-453.
- Vinacke, W. E. Stereotyping among national-racial groups in Hawaii: a study in ethnocentrism. Journal of Social Psychology, 1949, 30, 265-291.
- Walker, Helen, and Lev, J. Statistical inference. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953.
- Weinreich, U. Languages in contact. New York: The Language Circle of New York, 1953.
- Wheelis, A. The quest for identity. New York: Norton, 1958.
- Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Wylie, L. Youth in France and the United States. Daedalus, 1962, 91, 198-215.

APPENDIX A
COMPLETE TEXT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

This is an objective study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. Your answers will not be revealed to anyone! To begin with we would like to know if you are FOR or AGAINST the following issues. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. What we want is YOUR PERSONAL OPINION. Please indicate whether you are "for" or "against" the following issues by making a check mark in the appropriate space.

<u>HOW DO YOU STAND WITH RESPECT TO:</u>	FOR	AGAINST
1. Believing in democracy	_____	_____
2. Believing in God	_____	_____
3. Believing in Communism	_____	_____
4. Believing that French should be taught to all school children, beginning in kindergarten	_____	_____
5. Believing that Quebec could get along quite well without the rest of Canada	_____	_____
6. Believing that it is good to respect and uphold the traditions and heritage of our ancestors	_____	_____

In the questionnaire which follows are a number of paired statements. Your task is to express the degree to which you CAN or CANNOT see yourself being friends with each of the two persons described in EACH pair. Make your judgements on a scale from 1 to 9 by circling the number which best expresses your degree of preference.

Use the following scale as your guide:

I <u>can't</u> see myself being friends with such a person	I <u>can very easily</u> see myself being friends with such a person							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

FOR EXAMPLE:

Someone is asked to express the degree to which he can see himself being friends with the persons described in statements 1 (a) and 1 (b) below:

1(a) A person who likes classical music (1) 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Number (1) has been encircled in the example above, this means that the person who

made the response to statement 1(a) - can't see himself being friends with a person who likes classical music.

1(b) A person who likes popular music 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 ⑨

Number ⑨ has been encircled in example statements 1(b), this means that the person who made the response to statement 1(b), can very easily see himself being friends with a person who likes popular music.

REMEMBER your task is simply to circle the number which best expresses how much you can see yourself being friends with the persons described in the following statement pairs; so encircle one number after "a" and one number after "b" for each pair in the questionnaire.

PLEASE ASSUME THAT THE TWO PERSONS DESCRIBED IN EACH PAIR
ARE ALIKE IN ALL OTHER RESPECTS

ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

There may be some words which you don't understand. If this is the case please raise your hand. A supervisor will come to your assistance.

BEGIN NOW

- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | (a) | An English Canadian who respects and upholds the traditions and heritage of our ancestors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) | A French Canadian who respects and upholds the traditions and heritage of our ancestors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 2. | (a) | An English Canadian who does not believe in God | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) | An English Canadian who believes in God | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 3. | (a) | A French Canadian who thinks that Quebec could not get along at all without the rest of Canada | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) | An English Canadian who thinks that Quebec could get along quite well without the rest of Canada | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 4. | (a) | An English Canadian who does not believe in democracy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) | A French Canadian who does not believe in democracy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 5. | (a) | A French Canadian who is against teaching French to all school children, beginning in kindergarten | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) | A French Canadian who is in favour of teaching French to all school children beginning in kindergarten | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 6. | (a) | An English Canadian who is an anti-communist | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) | A French Canadian who is a communist | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. | (a) | An English Canadian who does not respect and uphold the traditions and heritage of our ancestors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) | A French Canadian who respects and upholds the traditions and heritage of our ancestors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 8. | (a) | An English Canadian who does not believe in God | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) | A French Canadian who does not believe in God | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 9. | (a) | An English Canadian who thinks that Quebec could not get along at all without the rest of Canada | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) | An English Canadian who thinks that Quebec could get along quite well without the rest of Canada | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 10. | (a) | A French Canadian who believes in democracy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) | An English Canadian who does not believe in democracy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 11. | (a) | A French Canadian who thinks that Quebec could get along quite well without the rest of Canada | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) | A French Canadian who thinks that Quebec could not get along at all without the rest of Canada | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 12. | (a) | An English Canadian who is an anti-communist | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) | A French Canadian who is an anti-communist | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13. | (a) An English Canadian who is in favour of teaching French to all school children beginning in kindergarten | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) An English Canadian who is against teaching French to all school children, beginning in kindergarten | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 14. | (a) A French Canadian who does not believe in God | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) An English Canadian who believes in God | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 15. | (a) A French Canadian who is in favour of teaching French to all school children, beginning in kindergarten | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) An English Canadian who is in favour of teaching French to all school children beginning in kindergarten | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 16. | (a) A French Canadian who believes in democracy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) A French Canadian who does not believe in democracy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 17. | (a) An English Canadian who respects and upholds the traditions and heritage of our ancestors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) A French Canadian who does not respect and uphold the traditions and heritage of our ancestors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 18. | (a) An English Canadian who believes in democracy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | (b) A French Canadian who believes in democracy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

19. (a) An English Canadian who thinks that Quebec could not get along at all without the rest of Canada 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) A French Canadian who thinks that Quebec could get along quite well without the rest of Canada 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
20. (a) An English Canadian who is an anti-communist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) An English Canadian who is a communist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
21. (a) An English Canadian who does not respect and uphold the traditions and heritage of our ancestors 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) A French Canadian who does not respect and uphold the traditions and heritage of our ancestors 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
22. (a) A French Canadian who is an anti-communist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) A French Canadian who is a communist
23. (a) An English Canadian who is against teaching French to all school children, beginning in kindergarten 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) A French Canadian who is in favour of teaching French to all school children beginning in kindergarten 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
24. (a) An English Canadian who believes in God 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) A French Canadian who believes in God 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
25. (a) An English Canadian who does not respect and uphold the traditions and heritage of our ancestors 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) An English Canadian who respects and upholds the traditions and heritage of our ancestors 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

26. (a) A French Canadian who does not believe in democracy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) An English Canadian who believes in democracy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
27. (a) A French Canadian who thinks that Quebec could get along quite well without the rest of Canada 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) An English Canadian who thinks that Quebec could get along quite well without the rest of Canada 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
28. (a) A French Canadian who is a communist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) An English Canadian who is a communist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
29. (a) A French Canadian who is against teaching French to all school children beginning in kindergarten 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) An English Canadian who is in favour of teaching French to all school children beginning in kindergarten 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
30. (a) A French Canadian who does not believe in God 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) A French Canadian who believes in God 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
31. (a) An English Canadian who thinks that Quebec could not get along at all without the rest of Canada 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) A French Canadian who thinks that Quebec could not get along at all without the rest of Canada 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
32. (a) An English Canadian who is a communist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) A French Canadian who is an anti-communist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

33. (a) A French Canadian who does not respect and uphold the tradition and heritage of our ancestors 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) A French Canadian who respects and upholds the tradition and heritage of our ancestors 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
34. (a) An English Canadian who does not believe in God 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) A French Canadian who believes in God 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
35. (a) An English Canadian who is against teaching French to all school children, beginning in kindergarten 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) A French Canadian who is against teaching French to all school children, beginning in kindergarten 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
36. (a) An English Canadian who does not believe in democracy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- (b) An English Canadian who believes in democracy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

INSTRUCTIONS

The following pages contain a series of statements. Read each one, decide how you feel about it, and then mark your answer after each question by circling the number in the scale which indicates the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

Here is an example of the scale you will use, and the meaning of each number in that scale.

I AGREE STRONGLY	I AGREE MODERATELY	I AGREE SLIGHTLY	I DISAGREE SLIGHTLY	I DISAGREE MODERATELY	I DISAGREE STRONGLY
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>

FOR EXAMPLE:

In reply to statement 1, below, someone has circled number "1"

1. A person must be pretty stupid if he doesn't like cake and ice cream (1) 2 3 4 5 6

This means that the person responding to statement 1, AGREES STRONGLY with the idea that it is stupid not to like cake and ice cream.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE:

In reply to statement 2, below, someone has circled number "6"

2. Anyone who know what is going on will tell you that the most popular attraction in any circus is the lion tamer. 1 2 3 4 5 (6)

This means that the person responding to statement 2, DISAGREES STRONGLY with the idea that the most popular attraction in any circus is the lion tamer.

ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

Your task then is to circle the number after each question which best expresses the degree of your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

REMEMBER: There are no right or wrong answers, we are interested in YOUR opinion. Your answers will not be revealed to anyone.

1. A person must be pretty shortsighted if he thinks that the conservatives represent the best interests of the Canadian people. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. It's the people who believe everything they read in the papers who are convinced that Russia is pursuing a ruthless policy of imperialist aggression. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. A person must be pretty gullible if he really believes that Communists have actually infiltrated into government and education. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. It's mostly those who are itching for a fight who want peace time conscription. 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. The truth of the matter is this! It is big business which wants to continue the cold war. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Make no mistake about it! The best way to achieve security is for the government to guarantee jobs for all. 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. It's perfectly clear to all decent people that all this fuss about communism does more harm than good. 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Thoughtful persons know that the Conservatives are not really interested in democracy. 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. It's perfectly clear to all thinking persons that the way to solve our financial problem is by a soak-the-rich program. 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. It's all too true that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. History clearly shows that it is the private enterprise system which is at the root of depression and wars. 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. It's simply incredible that anyone should believe that socialized medicine will actually help solve our health problems. 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. It's the fellow travellers or Communists who keep yelling all the time about Civil Rights. 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. It's the radicals and labor racketeers who yell the loudest about labor's right to strike. 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. You just can't help but feel sorry for the person who believes that the world could exist without a Creator. 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. It's usually the trouble-makers who talk about government ownership of public utilities. 1 2 3 4 5 6

17. Only a misguided idealist would believe that the Soviet Union is for peace. 1 2 3 4 5 6
18. It's mostly the noisy radicals who try to tell us that we will be better off under socialism. 1 2 3 4 5 6
19. Any intelligent person can plainly see that the real reason Canada is spending so much for defense is to stop aggression. 1 2 3 4 5 6
20. The American rearmament program is clear and positive proof that they are willing to sacrifice to preserve their freedom. 1 2 3 4 5 6
21. A study of Canadian history clearly shows that it is the Canadian businessman who has contributed most to our society. 1 2 3 4 5 6
22. Anyone who knows what's going on will tell you that those who favor communism are traitors to their country. 1 2 3 4 5 6
23. I often wish people would be more definite about things. 1 2 3 4 5 6
24. It is annoying to listen to a teacher who cannot seem to make up his mind as to what he really believes. 1 2 3 4 5 6
25. I find that a well-ordered way of life with regular hours agrees with me. 1 2 3 4 5 6
26. It is hard for me to sympathize with someone who is always doubting and unsure about things. 1 2 3 4 5 6
27. I often start things I never finish. 1 2 3 4 5 6
28. Our thinking would be a lot better off if we would just forget about words like "probably," "approximately," and "perhaps." 1 2 3 4 5 6
29. I never make judgments about people until I am sure of the facts. 1 2 3 4 5 6
30. A strong person will be able to make up his mind even on the most difficult questions. 1 2 3 4 5 6
31. For most questions there is just one right answer, once a person is able to get all the facts. 1 2 3 4 5 6
32. I like to have a place for everything and everything in its place. 1 2 3 4 5 6
33. I don't like to work on a problem unless there is the possibility of coming out with a clear-cut and unambiguous answer. 1 2 3 4 5 6

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34. It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 35. Most of the arguments or quarrels I get into are over matters of principle. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 36. I am known as a hard and steady worker. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 37. I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 38. Once I have my mind made up I seldom change it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 39. I think I am stricter about right and wrong than most people. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 40. I am in favor of a very strict enforcement of all laws, no matter what the consequences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 41. I always see to it that my work is carefully planned and organized. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 42. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 43. I set a high standard for myself and I feel others should do the same. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 44. People who seem unsure and uncertain about things make me feel uncomfortable. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

APPENDIX B

CANADIAN VERSION OF THE OPINIONATION SCALE

OPINIONATION SCALE

Canadian Version

1. It's just plain stupid to say that it was MacKenzie King who got us into the war.
2. A person must be pretty stupid if he still believes in differences between the races.
3. There are two kinds of people who fought Premier Douglas's socialization program: the selfish and the stupid.
4. A person must be pretty shortsighted if he thinks that the conservatives represent the best interests of the Canadian people.
5. It's the people who believe everything they read in the papers who are convinced that Russia is pursuing a ruthless policy of imperialist aggression.
6. It's mainly those who believe the propaganda put out by the real-estate interests who are against federal slum clearance program.
7. A person must be pretty gullible if he really believes that the Communists have actually infiltrated into government and education.
8. It's mostly those who are itching for a fight who want peace time conscription.
9. It is very foolish to advocate government support of religion.
10. Only a simple-minded fool would think that Senator McCarthy was a defender of American democracy.
11. It's perfectly clear that the decision to execute the Rosenbergs has done the United States more harm than good.
12. Any person with even a brain in his head knows that it would be dangerous to let the United States be run by men like General MacArthur.
13. The truth of the matter is this! It is big business which wants to continue the cold war.
14. Make no mistake about it! The best way to achieve security is for the government to guarantee jobs for all.
15. It's perfectly clear to all decent people that all this fuss about communism does more harm than good.

16. Thoughtful persons know that the Conservatives are not really interested in democracy.
17. It's perfectly clear to all thinking persons that the way to solve our financial problem is by a soak-the-rich program.
18. It's all too true that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer.
19. History clearly shows that it is the private enterprise system which is at the root of depression and wars.
20. Anyone who's old enough to remember the depression of the thirties will tell you that it's a lucky thing Prime Minister Bennett was never re-elected.
21. It's simply incredible that anyone should believe that socialized medicine will actually help solve our health problems.
22. A person must be pretty ignorant if he thinks that Diefenbaker is going to let "big business" run this country.
23. It's the fellow travellers of Communists who keep yelling all the time about Civil Rights.
24. It's the radicals and labor racketeers who yell the loudest about labor's right to strike.
25. It is foolish to think that the C.C.F. Party is really the party of the common man.
26. You just can't help but feel sorry for the person who believes that the world could exist without a Creator.
27. It's usually the trouble-makers who talk about government ownership of public utilities.
28. Only a misguided idealist would believe that the Soviet Union is for peace.
29. It's mostly the noisy radicals who try to tell us that we will be better off under socialism.
30. It's the agitators and left-wingers who are trying to get Red China into the United Nations.
31. Any intelligent person can plainly see that the real reason Canada is spending so much for defense is to stop aggression.
32. Plain common sense tells you that prejudice can be removed by education, not legislation.

33. Anyone who is really for democracy knows very well that the only way for Canada to head off revolution and civil war in backward countries is to support the United States foreign policy.
34. History will clearly show that Diefenbaker's victory over the Liberal Party in 1957 was a step forward for the Canadian people.
35. The American rearmament program is clear and positive proof that they are willing to sacrifice to preserve their freedom.
36. This much is certain! The only way to defeat tyranny in China is to support Chiang Kai-Shek.
37. It's already crystal-clear that the United Nations is a failure.
38. A study of Canadian history clearly shows that is the Canadian businessman who has contributed most to our society.
39. Even a person of average intelligence knows that to defend ourselves against aggression we should welcome all help--including Franco Spain.
40. Anyone who knows what's going on will tell you that those who favor communism are traitors to their country.

B29834